



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/825,561

04/15/2004

Udo Arend

09334.0011-00

9131

60668

7590

12/11/2008

SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/825,561	Applicant(s) AREND ET AL.	
	Examiner THANH T. VU	Art Unit 2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2175

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 09/22/2008.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 13-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messinger et al. ("Messinger", U.S. Pat. No. 7,000,187) and Cunningham et al. ("Cunningham", U.S. Pat. No. 2007/0129953).

Per claim 1, Messinger teaches a user interface for providing an entry point to processing a business activity, the user interface including a window on a computer screen comprising:

a first pane in the window for displaying one or more links to actions related to the business activity and for receiving a selection from a user of one of the one or more links (fig. 13A; task list 43; col. 5, lines 58-653), wherein one or more respective miniviews are associated with the one or more respective links, wherein each miniview displays structured and unstructured data corresponding to the respective link's actions (figs 9 and 13A; miniview display 50; structure data step 1 – step n; unstructured data: *graphical over lay 410c*; see, col. 7, lines 53-52; col. 10, lines 8-12); and

a second pane for displaying one of the one or more miniviews associated with the selected link (figs. 9 and 13A; pane 50), wherein content of the user interface and patterns with

Art Unit: 2175

respect to screen structure and semantics of the user interface are constructed based on a role of the user (col. 12, lines 33-41; *which shows tasks displayed in task list 43 are dependent upon a role of the user (i.e. a high level network administrator or a low level network administrator). Thus, based on the users' role, different layouts for task list (i.e. patterns) are displayed*) and wherein the patterns of the user interface are automatically selected for the user in the role from a common pool of user interface patterns (col. 12, line 35-41; *a layout of only a subset of task is displayed for a low level network administrator*). Messinger does not specifically teach the user interface patterns are selected from common pool of user interface pattern based on a particular business activity. However, Cunningham teaches user interface patterns are selected from common pool of user interface pattern based on a particular business activity ([0024], *selecting of certain data from a pool of data based on a particular business activity*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Cunningham in the invention of Messinger in order to provide a system and methods for managing information strategies of an organization.

Per claim 2, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the content of at least one of the one or more miniviews is reporting information (col. 5, lines 58-65; col. 10, lines 13-22 and lines 60-67; *each step reports a particular action for the user to perform an action to accomplish a task*).

Per claim 3, the modified Messinger teaches the user interface of claim 2, wherein the reporting information is displayed dynamically in the miniviews (Messinger, col. 10, lines 13-33; *each step is dynamically displayed in display area 50*).

Art Unit: 2175

Per claim 4, the modified Messenger teaches the user interface of claim 2, wherein the reporting information may be displayed in one of a pie chart, bar chart, and table (Messenger, figs. 9 and 13A; *graphical overlay table 401c with text description*, see col. 10, lines 23-33).

Per claim 5, the modified Messenger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the content of at least one of the one or more miniviews is a link to an associated activity (Messenger, figs 9 and 13A; col. 10, lines 13-15, and lines 60-65; *miniview 50 is linked to a particular step of a task*).

Per claim 6, the modified Messenger teaches interface of claim 5, wherein the miniviews with the link to an associated activity is also for receiving a user selection of the link to the associated activity (Messenger, figs 9 and 13A; col. 10, lines 13-15, and lines 60-65; *miniview 50 is linked to a particular step of a task*).

Per claim 7, the modified Messenger teaches the user interface of claim 6, wherein the user interface initiates the associated activity upon receipt of the user selection of the link to the associated activity (Messenger, figs 9 and 13A; col. 10, lines 13-15, and lines 60-65; *miniview 50 is linked to a particular step of a task*).

Per claim 8, the modified Messenger teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein the second pane comprises two or more miniviews (Messenger, figs. 9 and 13A; second pane 50).

Per claim 9, the modified Messenger teaches the user interface of claim 8, wherein a first of the two or more miniviews displays reporting information and a second of the two or more miniviews displays one or more links to associated activities (Messenger, figs. 9 and 13A; col. 10, lines 13-20 and 58-67).

Art Unit: 2175

Per claim 10, the modified Messenger teaches the user interface of claim 1, further comprising a third pane for displaying links to unstructured data (Messenger, col. 10, lines 23-33; third pane 410c).

Claims 13-22 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-10 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-12, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messenger, Cunningham, and Slivka et al. (“Slivka”, U.S. Pat. No. 6,061,695).

Per claims 11 and 12, the modified Messenger the user interface of claim 1 with a file menu (fig. 13c; file 24), but does not teach a third pane for displaying links to one or more folders, and a search request from the user. However, Slivka teaches a third pane for displaying links to one or more folders, and a search request from the user (figs. 2, 5, 7; col. 15, lines 25-47; “File Open” dialog provide user with folder view and the user can search for files). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Slivka in the invention of the modified Messenger in order to provide the user with a menu option to access folder view and search for files.

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 11 and 12 respectively.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2175

With regard to claim 1 and 13, the applicant argues that Cunningham does not teach the claimed limitation of “the patterns of the user interface are automatically selected for the user in the role from a common pool of user interface patterns based on the particular business activity.” The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case, Messinger teaches the patterns of the user interface are automatically selected for the user in the role from a common pool of user interface patterns (col. 12, line 35-41; *a layout of only a subset of task is automatically displayed (i.e. selected) for a low level network administrator*). In addition, Cunningham teaches user interface patterns are selected from common pool of user interface pattern based on a particular business activity ([0024], *selecting of certain data from a pool of data based on a particular business activity*). Accordingly, the combination of Messinger and Cunningham teach the claimed limitation.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2175

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THANH T. VU whose telephone number is (571)272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L. Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thanh T. Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175